UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT WESTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS AUSTIN DIVISION

| Ferrari Financial Services, Inc., | § | |
|-----------------------------------|---|----------------------------|
| Plaintiff, | § | |
| | § | |
| v. | § | Case No. 1:24-cv-01009-ADA |
| | § | |
| Taylor R. Mills and Taylor Mills | § | |
| Holdings MT, LLC, | § | |
| Defendants. | § | |
| | | |

ORDER

Before the Court is the report and recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge Dustin M. Howell concerning Plaintiff Ferrari Financial Services, Inc's Motion for Default Judgment. Dkt. 14. Judge Howell issued his report and recommendation on February 4, 2025. *Id.* at 11. Plaintiff filed an objection to the report and recommendation on March 11, 2025. *Id.* at 17

A party may file specific, written objections to a magistrate judge's proposed findings and recommendations within fourteen days after being served with a copy of the report and recommendation, thereby securing *de novo* review by the district court. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(C). When no objections are timely filed, the Court reviews the magistrate's report and recommendation for clear error. *See United States v. Wilson*, 864 F.2d 1219, 1221 (5th Cir. 1989).

Although Plaintiff filed an untimely objection to the report and recommendation, the Court has considered the objection in the interest of justice. Having conducted a *de novo* review of the motion for default judgment, the report and recommendation, the objection to the report and recommendation, and the applicable

laws, the Court finds that Plaintiff's objection should be overruled and that the report and recommendation should be adopted.

Accordingly, the Court **ORDERS** that the Report and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge (Dkt. 14) is **ADOPTED**. Plaintiff's motion for default judgment (Dkt. 13) is **GRANTED IN PART** and **DENIED IN PART**. Specifically (1) Plaintiff's request for default judgment against Defendants is **GRANTED**; (2) Plaintiff's request for monetary damages including prejudgment and postjudgment interest is **GRANTED**; and (3) Plaintiff's request for a writ of sequestration and for attorneys' fees and costs is **DENIED** without prejudice.¹

SIGNED on April 21, 2025.

ALAN D. ALBRIGHT

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

¹ Although the Court denies Plaintiff's request for attorneys' fees and costs at this time, if Plaintiff files a timely motion for attorneys' fees and costs after judgment has been entered, the Court will reconsider its request. *See* FED. R. CIV. P. 54(d).